



JPW
AP
B

APPELLANT'S BRIEF AND APPENDICES

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop, Appeal Brief-Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, on the 20 day of January 2006

Richard B. O'Planick, Registration No. 29,096



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appellant's Brief	1
Real Party in Interest.....	1
Related Appeals and Interferences.....	1
Status of The Claims.....	1
Status of Amendments	2
Summary of the Invention	2
Issues.....	3
Argument	3
I. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 18 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Juzswik et al (US 6,612,165 B2) in view of Hardman et al (US 2002/0126005 A1) and Harm et al (US 2004/0084517 A1).	3
	5
II. Claims 2, 3, 5, 16, and 17 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al in view of Hardman et al and Harm in view of state of the art representations of Appellant	7
III. Claim 10 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al as modified by Hardman et al and Harm et al in view of Meadows (US 6, 149,060).	8
Conclusion	10
Claims Appendix	Appendix 1
Claims Involved in Appeal	Appendix 1
Evidence Appendix.....	Appendix 2
Related Proceedings Appendix	Appendix 3



In re Application of:

Robert Leon Benedict

For: METHOD OF INTEGRATING TIRE

IDENTIFICATION INTO A VEHICLE

INFORMATION SYSTEM

Serial No.: 10/690,876

Filed: October 23, 2003

)

)

)

)

)

Confirmation No.: 6825

Docket No.: DN2003177

Art Unit: 2876

Examiner: Jared Fureman

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF
PATENT APPEALS AND
INTERFERENCE**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Appellant, by virtue of his Notice of Appeal filed November 23, 2005, hereby files his Brief in response to the Final Rejection of all pending claims in the above-identified application. Please charge my Deposit Account No. 07-1725 in the amount of Five Hundred and 00/100 Dollars (\$500.00) to cover the fee for filing this Brief in support of this Appeal. Any deficiency or overpayment should be charged to this Deposit Account.

Real Party in Interest

By virtue of an Assignment dated October 22, 2003, by the named inventor, the real party in interest is The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company. The October 22, 2003 Assignment has not been recorded in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no related appeals or interferences.

Status Of The Claims

Claims 1 through 18 are pending in the application. Claims 1 through 18 stand rejected.

01/24/2006 WARDLR1 00000045 071725 10690876

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Status Of Amendments

There are no outstanding amendments. A response after final was filed November 23, 2005 following Final Rejection of the application correcting antecedent basis informalities as to claims 3 and 5.

Summary of the Invention

The subject invention as claimed comprises a novel method for integrating tire identification data and vehicular identification data. The method sequences the steps of: manufacturing a tire tag having data retention tag memory; writing tag identification data into the tag memory; affixing the tag to a tire; writing tire identification data identifying the tire into the tag memory; thereafter associating the tire with a specific vehicle; and reading the tire identification data from the tag memory into a vehicle data retention memory. The novel sequence allows for a centralized storage of data in the tire data retention memory as well as the vehicle data retention memory. Associating tire with vehicle identification data pursuant to the claimed method facilitates tracking the tire throughout the lifetime of the tire and the vehicle. The tire identification data may further be uploaded to an archive database (claim 2). Responsibility for the performance of the method steps may be allocated between the tag supplier; the tire supplier; and the vehicle manufacturer (claim 3). Additional steps of calibrating tag functions and including tag function calibration data into the tag identification data may be performed. A vehicle identification code may further be read from the vehicle data retention memory into the tag identification data (claim 5) whereby identification of the original OEM vehicle may be ascertained from memory within the tire throughout the lifetime of the tire. The tag may comprise an antenna and a transponder for monitoring tire parameters such as temperature and pressure.

Pursuant to the invention, the transfer of data between the tag and the vehicle is by means of the vehicle electronic control unit (ECU) and a transfer of such data is made from the ECU to the OEM archive database. Operational parameters from the tag may further be incorporated into the tire identification data. The transfer of data between the tire identification tag and the vehicle ECU to the OEM archive database and from the vehicle/ OEM database to the tire identification tag memory may be conducted contemporaneously and as part of running diagnostic test(s) at the conclusion of vehicle assembly.

Issues

- I. Are claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 18 obvious under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Juzswik et al (US 6,612,165 B2) in view of Hardman et al (US 2002/0126005 A1) and Harm et al (US 2004/0084517 A1).
- II. Are claims 2, 3, 5, 16, and 17 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al in view of Hardman et al and Harm in view of state of the art representations of Appellant.
- III. Is claim 10 obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al as modified by Hardman et al and Harm et al in view of Meadows (US 6, 149,060).

ARGUMENT

- I. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 18 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) over Juzswik et al (US 6,612,165 B2) in view of Hardman et al (US 2002/0126005 A1) and Harm et al (US 2004/0084517 A1).

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, there (1) must be some suggestion or motivation in the art to modify or combine the references; (2) must be a reasonable expectation of success and (3) the combined references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Simply put, the Examiner in the subject case has pointed to no suggestion or motivation in the art to modify or combine the references in the manner proposed. Moreover, the combined references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations for no reference teaches a sequential procedure for integrating tire identification data with vehicle identification data according the steps of the claimed method.

The subject invention, as claimed, is directed to a method for integrating tire identification and vehicular identification data pursuant to a specific sequence of steps. The invention method provides for effective and efficient data management and integration between a tire data retention system (utilizing tire tag means) and a vehicle data retention system (independent claims 1, 9, 13, and claims dependent therefrom). The data so integrated may be uploaded to an archive database (claims 2, 9, 13); the steps to the method may be efficiently divided between a tire tag supplier, a tire supplier, and a vehicle manufacturer (claims 3, 9); calibrating tag functions (claims 4, 9); and integrating tire identification data with vehicle identification data in a common database and vice versa (claims 5, 8, 10, 12). The invention method according to a further aspect schedules data management between a tire

based data system and a vehicle based data system with a vehicle ECU contemporaneously with the running of a diagnostic test on the vehicle at the conclusion of manufacture.

The Examiner has simply failed to provide a reference or multiple references that teach or suggest the claimed methodology. Nevertheless, solely through improper hindsight, the Examiner has drawn an improper and unsupported conclusion that the subject invention would be obvious to one skilled in the art. The end result of the invention method is a planned sequential and efficient integration of data between a tire database and a vehicle data base. No reference even addresses this objective, much less accomplishes the intended result.

Juzswik teaches a tire pressure monitoring system that is *operationally* (emphasis added) linked to a vehicle base unit. Tire pressure data generated during operation of the vehicle is transmitted to the vehicle unit and compared with a range of permissible pressures. Such a system is not related to an integration between a tire database, including tag and tire identification, and a vehicle database and/or ECU during vehicle assembly. The claimed method is not directed to the sharing of measurement data between a tire based pressure monitoring system and a vehicle based controller during the operation of the vehicle. Rather, the claimed method is directed to a coordinated sequence of manufacturing a tag having tag memory, writing tag identification data into the tag memory, affixing the tag to a tire; writing tire identification data into the tag memory; assembling the tire to a vehicle; and then reading the tire and tag identification data into the vehicle database.

The Examiner points to Juzswik as teaching the step of writing tag means identification data into the tag memory and, in particular, column 3, lines 42-47 thereof as teaching writing tag means identification data into tag memory. However, there is no teaching to write tire identification data identifying the tire into the tag memory. Moreover, there is no teaching as to when in the sequence of tire tag, tire, and vehicle assembly the writing of tag identification into tag memory occurs in Juzswik. The Examiner has pointed to an end result in Juzswik as a basis for rejection the subject method that incorporates a sequence of steps in a preferred and advantageous order. Such a basis for rejection is not appropriate and extends the meaning of the reference well beyond its literal and implied boundaries.

Likewise, the Examiner points to column 3, lines 1-column 4, line 18, and column 5 lines 15-27, as teaching validation of tag identification data throughout the life cycle of the vehicle. However, again, the disclosure does not contain any reference as to when or by what party the tag identification data is stored (see claims 1, 9, 13 and their dependencies). Nor does the reference teach the inclusion of vehicle identification data in the tag memory (claims 3, 8). Nor does the reference teach a coordinated exchange of data at the endpoint in the

vehicle assembly at which a diagnostic of the vehicle systems is conducted. The Examiner has not, in short, made any showing from Juzswik as to the claimed coordinated sequence of steps. It is noted that the Examiner has conceded that Juzswik does not teach calibrating tag functions; including calibration data into the tag means identification data; writing a vehicle identification code identifying the specific vehicle into the tag memory. Appellant further contends that Juzswik does not teach uploading tire identification data from the vehicle data retention memory to an archive database (claims 2, 9, 13 and their dependencies); a division by party as to the steps performed in claim 1 (claim 3); writing an OEM part number into the tag memory prior to transferring the tire to an OEM (claims 8 and 10); validation of tire identification data in the vehicle electronic control unit against tire identification data of tires used by the vehicle throughout the lifecycle of the vehicle (claim 11); reading the tire identification data from the tire data storage means into the ECU database contemporaneously with the running of a diagnostic test at the conclusion of vehicle assembly (claim 17).

The addition of Hardman does nothing to ameliorate the deficiencies of Juzswik discussed above. Hardman in paragraph 120, as the Examiner notes, speaks to a reader 30 that may request information from memory locations of a tire tag 70. Nowhere, however, in Hardman, is there any teaching as to when such information is stored within the tag memory relative to vehicle and tire manufacture and assembly, or when the communication of such information is made relative to a vehicle data retention memory as required by the claimed invention. The sequence of the claimed methodology is intended to comprise an efficient and productive means by which tag, tire, and vehicle information are gathered, stored, and communicated between the tire, the vehicle, and an archive database. The sequencing of such steps and the coordination of such communication at a stage when the vehicle diagnostic is run is not found or suggested in Hardman. Hardman, therefore, fails in the same manner as Juzswik in achieving a methodology incorporating the benefits of the claimed invention. It is further noted, as the Examiner concedes, that Hardman in conjunction with Juzswik fails to teach writing tire identification identifying data from the tag memory into a vehicle database; connecting the tire database to the vehicle electronic control unit by means of a vehicle data bus. Appellant submits further that there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference that would direct one skilled in the art as to the desirability or feasibility of incorporating such capability. Nor is there any teaching in either reference demonstrating an appreciation of their respective deficiencies in the aforementioned areas.

The addition of Harm to the references above does not cure the deficiencies in the prior references for at least the reasons set forth above and for the following reasons. The claimed

invention as specified and claimed recites a sequence of steps that none of the references, including Harm, teach or suggest. Harm does not teach a sequence in which a tag is manufactured and identification data is then written into the tag memory; subsequently the tag is affixed to a tire and tire related information is then written into tag memory; and then the tire is associated with a specific vehicle and the tire identification memory is then written into the vehicle data base from the tag memory. Nowhere is such a method disclosed in any of the cited art. Harm fails to teach the coordination of information storage into a tag memory vis-a-vis a tag manufacturer and a tire manufacturer, and a subsequent integration of vehicle information into the tag and an upload of relevant information at the running of system diagnostics at the conclusion of vehicle manufacture. The Examiner has pointed to no such teaching in any of the references to instruct one skilled in the art as to such a sequence.

Appellant further submits by way of an affidavit under 37 C.F.R. 131 showing the invention was made by Appellant prior to the effective date of the Harm reference. As such, Harm is further not applicable as prior art in the combination proposed. Consideration of the submitted affidavit and removal of the Harm reference against the allowance of the pending claims are requested.

As Juzswik in view of Hardman and Harm fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the invention as recited in claims 1-18, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Appellant reiterates that the claims set forth a method of particular steps performed in a recited sequence. The art does not individually or collectively teach or suggest the combination of steps performed in the recited sequence and can, therefore, not provide a valid basis on which to conclude the claims are obvious. While one of ordinary skill in the art could try modifying the methodology taught in the references to meet the claim language, such is not the proper standard for obviousness absent a teaching or suggestion to do so. In the subject combination of references, the Examiner has pointed to no teaching or suggestion from the references themselves that would instruct one of skill in the art to make the selective combination of step and sequence modifications necessary to meet all the recitations in pending claims 1, 4, 6-9, 11-15 and 18.

II. Claims 2, 3, 5, 16, and 17 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al in view of Hardman et al and Harm in view of state of the art representations of Appellant

As discussed above, the Harm reference is not prior art to the subject invention as evidenced through the submitted affidavit. In addition, the Examiner is in error that the disclosure set forth in the pending specification in combination with Juzswik, Hardman, and Harm can be deemed to render the invention obvious. Nowhere in paragraph 6 of the specification does Appellant admit that it is the state of the art to upload tag identification, tire identification, and vehicle identification pursuant to claims 1-18 at the end stage in vehicle manufacturer when a diagnostic test is run. Certainly, a diagnostic test is run on vehicles systems such as engine controls, ECU protocols, etc. Appellant does not dispute that a diagnostic system test is conducted on new vehicles prior to completion of their manufacture. However, Appellant certainly does maintain, and the specification makes clear, that the diagnostic stage of a car's manufacturer has not been used as the stage for uploading tire, tag, and correlated vehicle identification information incorporated into the tag database pursuant to the claimed sequence of steps. The Examiner has pointed to no prior art mentioning in any respect, either explicitly or by suggestion, a coordinated integration of tire and tag information into a tag database and a subsequent integration of data from the tag database timed to contemporaneously occur at the running of final diagnostics on a newly manufactured vehicle. The invention, therefore, cannot be considered obvious in view of the complete silence and lack of teaching in every reference as to the claimed method of integration.

Re the rejection of claim 5, rewriting a vehicle identification code from the vehicle from Juzswik does not eliminate the deficiency in Juzswik in teaching the sequence of steps of claim 5 in combination with the steps of claim 1 wherein the *vehicle identification code is rewritten* (emphasis added) from the vehicle code from the vehicle. Nowhere does Juzswik speak to rewriting a vehicle identification code.

Again, one of ordinary skill in the art could try modifying the methodology taught in the references to meet the claim language, such is not the proper standard for obviousness absent a teaching or suggestion to do so. In the subject combination of references, the Examiner has pointed to no teaching or suggestion from the references themselves that would instruct one of skill in the art to make the selective combination of step and sequence modifications necessary to meet all the recitations, including step and sequence limitations, in pending claims 2, 3, 5, 16 and 17.

III. Claim 10 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) over Juzswik et al as modified by Hardman et al and Harm et al in view of Meadows (US 6, 149,060).

Meadows relates to a method of identifying a tire through the use of siping, creating a bar code. As such, it is totally unrelated to incorporating part information into a tire tag with tag and tire identification information, including the information set forth in claim 9. Meadows, as such, is not a relevant basis for concluding the subject invention as obvious. Moreover, the paragraph relied upon by the Examiner, namely column 3, lines 16-17, is directed to a bar code that incorporates the tire manufacturer's part number into the rubber product, not the OEM part number into a tag memory prior to transferring the tire to an OEM as required by claim 10. Nowhere does Meadows teach the incorporation of an OEM part number into a tire tag whereby, when the data is uploaded into a vehicle ECU and therefrom into an OEM database may be correlated and verified. The utility and efficiency of the invention as claimed in claim 10 allows the OEM to ensure that the tire placed on the vehicle is the intended tire *pursuant to the OEM's part number* (emphasis added). Not only is a valuable benefit obtained at that stage, but the OEM part number can be read from the tag throughout the life of the tire and a replacement tire can be so identified. Meadows is insufficient in teaching or suggesting the claimed method and does not afford the benefits so attained by the claimed invention.

Appellant again points out that while one of ordinary skill in the art could try modifying the methodology taught in the references to meet the claim language of claim 10, such is not the proper standard for obviousness absent a teaching or suggestion to do so. In the subject combination of references, the Examiner has pointed to no teaching or suggestion from the references themselves that would instruct one of skill in the art to make the selective combination of step and sequence modifications necessary to meet all the recitations, including step and sequence limitations, in pending claim 10.

Regarding specifically the Examiner's response to the previously submitted arguments of Appellant, Appellant submits that the previously submitted arguments have been mischaracterized. Appellant's arguments point out that none of the references follow the same steps in the same sequence as set forth in the pending claims. Only by a modification of the steps and sequence in each of the references could the claimed invention be achieved. The Examiner contends such modifications and re-organization to the steps and sequence in the art would be obvious without providing any teaching or suggestion from the references

themselves. Appellant has additionally noted that it can hardly be obvious to modify the methodology steps and sequences in the prior art when such a modification would run counter to the specific teachings in each reference. The Examiner has shown no instruction to one skilled in the art on selectively modifying and combining the cited references that would, without the improper aid of hindsight, result in the claimed invention.

In regard to the Examiner's comments that claim 1 does not require the uploading of information from the vehicle at the running of system diagnostics at the conclusion of vehicle manufacture, Appellant disagrees. Claim 1 specifically recites a reading of tire identification data from the tag memory into a vehicle data retention memory (emphasis added) as the last step in the sequence. Clearly the vehicle has been manufactured when the step is performed as the term "vehicle" in such a limitation connotes. The sequence of steps concludes with uploading of information from a tag memory that is in a tire that has been previously associated with a specific vehicle (step e). The Examiner's contention that uploading information from a vehicle may be conducted prior to the conclusion of vehicle manufacture runs counter to the language of the claims as interpreted in light of the specification.

Regarding the statements in the Background of the Invention relied upon by the Examiner, Appellant maintains that the statements are mis-characterized and mis-applied in the subject rejection. No prior art cited by the Examiner teaches the claimed method and sequence, including Harm. Appellant has in the Background pointed that other types of vehicle information, not tire related data, is uploaded at the end of a vehicle's manufacture. In short, prior practice in the industry in not uploading tire information concurrent with other vehicle information is strong evidence of the non-obvious character of the claimed invention. Harm does not teach such a sequence of steps. Absent some teaching or suggestion in the prior art, the conclusion of obviousness is considered solely dependent on hindsight using the invention as a blueprint. There is further no suggestion on a division of tire information actions as recited in the claims. The gaps in the prior art teachings, and lack of suggestion as to the claimed method and sequence cannot be waived by a statement that such gaps are filled by knowledge generally available to those of skill in the art. The Examiner has accumulated art reflective of knowledge available to those skilled in the art and none of the art suggests or teaches modifications necessary to meet the limitations of the claims.

Regarding the Examiner's refusal to admit Appellant's affidavit as evidence of reduction to practice in reference to Harm, Appellant traverses the refusal. The Affidavit clearly predates Harm and encompasses documentary evidence that the sequence of steps embodied in the claims predates Harm. The nature of the invention is a procedural method and

sequence of steps. Given the nature of the invention, the character and reasonableness of the evidence provided in the affidavit coupled with the comparatively short time between the date of October 9, 2001 and the October 22, 2003 is evidence of diligent reduction to practice. Nevertheless, even considering the Harm reference to be prior art, Harm in combination with the other cited art simply fails to suggest or teach the claimed series of steps in the claimed sequence.

As to the bar code of Meadows , as discussed previously, application of siping in a tire to designate a product number is totally unrelated to tag data storage and the sequence for introducing the data into tag memory. The Meadows reference teaches applying a product identification contemporaneous with the tire manufacture and therefore would not be instructive at all to one skilled in the art toward achieving the claimed method. Meadows, in fact, teaches away from incorporating tire information into a tire after the tire is manufactured. Appellant reiterates that no teaching or suggestion has been identified in any of the references that would instruct one skilled in the art to the claimed method. The method claimed in claims 1-18 is specific as to the steps to be followed and their sequence. While isolated use of tags within a tire has been pursued, that is not what is being claimed. The art cited individually and collectively fails to set forth the series of steps in the recited sequence of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In rejecting claims under 35 USC § 103, the examiner bears the initial burden of presenting a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The Examiner has not met that burden here. No cited reference teaches the claimed steps in the claimed sequence as set forth in claims 1-18. Moreover, no reference addresses the same problem as the present invention; namely, a method by which an efficient, cost effective, and timely cross-transmittal and sharing of vehicle and tire information may be accomplished in a new vehicle.

‘We have noted elsewhere, as a “useful general rule,” that references that teach away cannot serve to create a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Gurley, 27 F.3d 551, 553, 31 U.S.P.Q. 1131, 1132 (Fed. Cir. 1994). In the subject case, each reference fails to teach the claimed steps in the claimed sequence and, accordingly, teach away from the invention.

Focusing on the obviousness of substitution, and differences, instead of the invention as a whole, is a legally improper way to simplify the often-difficult determination of obviousness. See Hybritech, Inc., v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc., 802 F.2d 1367, 1383, 231 USPQ 81, 93

(Fed. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 480 U.S. 947 (1987). Not only must the claimed invention as a whole be evaluated, but so also must the references as a whole, so that their teachings are applied in the context of their significance to one skilled in the art at the time that is one skilled in the art without knowledge of the solution. See Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed.Cir. 1985). In the subject application, the solution to the stated problem is neither recognized nor achieved by any of the cited art. It is only with the aid of impermissible hindsight, using knowledge of the solution as set forth in the pending invention, could one skilled in the art modify and combine the references in the manner proposed.

Determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 requires an analysis of the claimed invention as a whole, and focusing of obviousness of substitutions and differences instead of an invention as a whole is an illegally improper way to simplify the determination of obviousness. Gillette Company v. S. C. Johnson and Son, Inc. (CAFC) 16 USPQ 2nd 1923 (1990). Appellant has shown that the prior art of record is silent as to setting forth the claimed method in the sequence of steps specified by the claims. No cited art supports or teaches a modification and combination to achieve the method set forth in claims 1-18 and no prima facie case of obviousness has been established.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-18 and an allowance of all pending claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard B. O'Planick, Registration No. 29,096
Attorney for Appellant

The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company
Intellectual Property Law Department 823
1144 East Market Street
Akron, Ohio 44316-0001
Telephone: (330) 796-5240



CLAIMS APPENDIX



CLAIMS

1. A method for integrating tire identification data and vehicular identification data, comprising the steps:
 - a. manufacturing tire tag means having data retention tag memory;
 - b. writing tag means identification data into tag memory;
 - c. affixing the tag means to a tire;
 - d. writing tire identification data identifying the tire into the tag memory;
 - e. associating the tire with a specific vehicle;
 - f. reading the tire identification data from the tag memory into a vehicle data retention memory.
2. A method according to claim 1, wherein further comprising the step of uploading the tire identification data from the vehicle data retention memory to an archive database.
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein steps a and b are conducted by a tire tag means supplier; steps c and d are conducted by a tire supplier; and steps d, e, and f are conducted by a vehicle manufacturer.
4. A method according to claim 1, wherein further comprising the steps of:
calibrating tag functions; and
including tag functions calibration data into the tag means identification data.
5. A method according to claim 1, further comprising the steps:
reading the tire identification data from the vehicle data retention memory;
and
rewriting a vehicle identification code from the vehicle.
6. A method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of manufacturing the tag means to include a transponder and antenna assembly.
7. A method according to claim 6, further comprising the step of manufacturing the antenna in an annular form coupled to the transponder.

8. A method according to claim 1, further comprising the step of writing a vehicle identification code identifying the specific vehicle into the tag memory.
9. A method for integrating tire identification data and OEM vehicular identification data in a vehicle having a tire based sensor system, comprising the steps:
 - a. manufacturing tire tag means comprising a transponder and a tire tag having at least a pressure sensor;
 - b. calibrating the pressure sensor for tag functions;
 - c. writing tag identification and calibration data into tag memory;
 - d. transferring the tag means to a tire manufacturer;
 - e. manufacturing a tag and antenna assembly;
 - f. integrating the tag and antenna assembly into a tire;
 - g. writing tire identification data into tag memory;
 - h. transferring the tire to an OEM;
 - i. initializing a vehicle system;
 - j. reading tire identification data from tag memory into an electronic control unit of the vehicle; and
 - k. uploading tire identification data from the electronic control unit to an OEM data base.
10. A method according to claim 9 including the step of writing an OEM part number into the tag memory prior to transferring the tire to an OEM.
11. A method according to claim 9 including the step of validating the tire identification data in the vehicle electronic control unit against the tire identification data of tires used by the vehicle throughout the lifecycle of the vehicle.
12. A method according to claim 9 including the step of writing a vehicle identification number to tag memory.
13. A method for integrating tire data into the information system of a vehicle, comprising the steps:

- a. mounting a tire to a production line vehicle chassis, the tire having tire data storage means for storing tire identification data;
 - b. connecting the tire data storage means to a vehicle electronic control unit (ECU) having ECU data storage means;
 - c. reading tire identification data from the tire data storage means into the ECU data storage means; and
 - d. uploading the tire identification data from the ECU data storage means to an OEM database.
14. A method according to claim 13 further comprising the steps:
incorporating a tire pressure monitoring system into the tire; and
including tire pressure monitoring system identification data in the tire identification data.
15. A method according to claim 14 further comprising the step of
incorporating tire pressure monitoring system operational parameters in the tire identification data.
16. A method according to claim 13 further comprising the steps:
incorporating vehicle identification data into the ECU database means;
uploading the vehicle identification data from the ECU data storage means to the OEM database.
17. A method according to claim 13, further comprising the steps:
running a diagnostic test on the vehicle substantially at the conclusion of vehicle assembly; and
reading the tire identification data from the tire data storage means into the ECU data storage means substantially contemporaneous with the running of the diagnostic test.
18. A method according to claim 13 further comprising the step of connecting the tire data storage means to the vehicle electronic control unit by means of a vehicle data bus.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.



RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX